



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,032	05/31/2007	Yoshitugi Hashiba	MIYG.0003	2346

7590 03/20/2009  
Stanley P. Fisher  
REED SMITH LLP  
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400  
Falls Church, VA 22042

EXAMINER
----------

DURAND, PAUL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3721

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/20/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/567,032	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HASHIBA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PAUL R. DURAND	<b>Art Unit</b> 3721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is supplemental to the Non-Final Office Action mailed 12/17/2008.

The previous action should be disregarded and the time period for reply has been reset.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 7, 8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmied (US 3,269,079) in view of Jones (US 5,682,758).

In claims 7 and 11-13, Schmied discloses the invention as claimed including heating device 61, charging/filling device 21, sealing device 11 and subsequent cooling of the package by air (see figure 1 and col. 2, line 47 - col. 3, line 19).

What Schmied does not disclose is the use of a cooling device which supports the package during cooling. However, Jones teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide a cooling device 18, which cools a product 28, while being supported on a conveyor against gravity (see figure 1 and col. 4, lines 26-34).

Moreover, while the combination of Schmied does not disclose the use of a granular object having adsorption properties, the claims are drawn to an apparatus and as such, must be distinguished over the prior art in terms of structure and not the article worked upon by the apparatus. See *generally* MPEP § 2115.

Art Unit: 3721

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Schmied with the cooling means as taught by Jones for the purpose of cooling a heated packaged product to an ambient temperature.

In claim 8, the claim does not further claim any structural limitation and appears to be an intended use recitation. A claim containing a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus if the prior art apparatus teaches all the *structural* limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). *See also* MPEP § 2114.

4. Claims 9, 10 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmied and Jones in view of Tramposch et al. (US 6,131,368).

In claims 9 and 10, the modified invention of Schmied discloses the invention as claimed and as applied to claims 1 and 2 above except for the heating range of 55-80 degrees C. However, Tramposch teaches that it is old and well known in the art to heat an adsorption material to a temperature between 40-90 degrees C for the purpose of preventing an oxidizing surface on the material (see col. 4, line 53 - col. 5, line 30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified invention of Schmied with the heating range as taught by Tramposch for the purpose of preventing an oxidizing surface on the material.

Art Unit: 3721

In claims 14-21, the modified invention of Schmied discloses the invention as claimed including packaging an object utilizing heating and cooling according to the apparatuses claimed in claims 7-13. What, the modified invention of Schmied does not disclose is the use of a granular object having adsorption properties. However, Tramposch teaches that it is old and well known in the art to provide a method of heating a granular object having adsorption properties, placing the granules in a storage bag, sealing the bag and cooling the bag to form a packaged product for the purpose of packaging a product susceptible to outside contamination (see col. 3, line 29 - col. 4, line 16 and col. 8, lines 28-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified invention of Schmied with the adsorption packaging process as taught by Tramposch.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL R. DURAND whose telephone number is (571)272-4459. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3721

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PAUL R. DURAND/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721  
March 19, 2009